

PETER CLARK

## European Urban History and the Value of Studying Urban Regions

I want first to express my thanks to the Italian Association and its President Rosa Tamborrino for inviting me to give this lecture today and to warmly congratulate the Association on its 20<sup>th</sup> birthday. Here I would like to add a tribute to my dear friend Professor Donatella Calabi who has been so important in promoting urban history not only in Italy but across Europe.

In my talk today I will argue for the value of studying urban regions for understanding the theme of this lecture series- European urban history and its cultural geographies, taking the period from the Middle Ages to the present time. Until recently Europe's urban regions have been insufficiently recognized by urban historians, but that is starting to change. After discussing the existing literature I want to illustrate my argument through a historical case study of the evolution of the outer Northern urban region. I will conclude with a general discussion of some of the key problems and research dividends of a regional approach.

But to start let us remind ourselves of the three key concerns of urban history. Firstly It is interdisciplinary. A multidisciplinary approach to the study of the city is unavoidable. For how else can we hope to understand such a complex, volatile and dynamic urban phenomenon impacting on social ,spatial economic, cultural and political development, without drawing on the expertise, insights and data sets of a raft of disciplines- from archaeology and art history, to ecology, geography and the other social sciences. Again urban history is concerned with the *longue duree*. Why? Because cities e towns are a long-term historical construct- the vast majority in Europe ( as also in China and the Middle East) were founded before 1600, and many in Mediterranean Europe in Roman and pre-Roman times. In consequence, towns

are a historical palimpsest with many different institutional, spatial and other layers embedded there, just as the aggregate pace of urban change tends to be gradual-through slow roller coasters rather than sudden zig-zags. Thirdly and this is my last general point, urban history is comparative. As we all know, a study which focuses on a single community without a comparative perspective, be it local, national or wider, is not urban history but local history, a different field.

Urban history is clearly an increasingly dynamic field. As previous lecturers have shown, over the last decades, particularly over the last 20 years during the time of this Association, there has been an explosion of research and publications on urban history. Prominent have been thematic studies- on urban architecture, on green space, migration, urban inequality, urban representation and much else. No less important has been the growth of what might describe broadly as network studies. We have a great deal of research now on clusters of towns, towns and their hinterlands, riverside towns, ports and so on. Sometimes these have taken a large area, a sub-region of a country, others have been more local. No less important, have been national studies. One thinks here of Bernard Lepetit's famous book on the creation of France's urban system in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, or the 3 volume *Cambridge Urban History of Britain* ( part thematic, part network study) or the new volume edited by Marc Boone and others on the *City and Society in the Low Countries 1100-1600*. In addition we have studies, such as those by Lynn Lees and others analysing European urbanization, and more recently volumes such as the *Oxford Handbook of Cities in World History* which sets European networks in comparison with those in Asia, , the Americas and Africa.

Surprisingly in this rich banquet of literature the study of Europe's big urban regions has fared less well. As we will see, research has been precocious, patchy, misleading or non-existent. Partly it is an issue of funding (national research councils prefer to fund national or local projects); partly as we will see the study of

Europe's urban regions faces various challenges of definition and explanation; the story is complicated.

I argue in my book *European Cities and Towns* that there are four main historic urban regions in Europe- Western Europe, including England; outer northern Europe (reaching from Ireland, through Scotland to the Nordic countries and maybe Baltic state cities); Central/Eastern Europe, including European Russia, and of course Mediterranean Europe.

One index of the reality of these urban regions and of regional differentiation is provided by divergent demographic trends as you can see from this graph based mostly on Paul Bairoch's data pre 1850, and then various statistical sources. In the Middle Ages, the Medit. region was the most urbanised, the North the least; in the early modern era Western Europe took the dominant position which it has retained; but in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century Northern cities see accelerated urbanisation, with Central/Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean catching up in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Another index of regional differentiation is provided by the divergent development of capital cities since the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Research on capital cities I have been doing for the forthcoming *Cambridge Urban History of Europe* highlights the rise in Western Europe of powerful economic, political and cultural metropolises like London, Brussels, Paris and later Berlin, with extensive colonial empires by 1900 which has helped transform them into sprawling global cities by 2000. In contrast, Northern capitals like Dublin, Stockholm or Helsinki, though enjoying strong primate status in their countries, are much smaller in population and much more compact. In Eastern Europe we find another picture with a region dominated for much of the period by land-based imperial capitals: Austro-Hungarian Vienna and Czarist St Petersburg up to First World War, and then Soviet Moscow after the Second World

War; when these capitals crashed in 1917-18 and 1990 they hatched a large number of medium or small capitals. Finally the Mediterranean zone includes large capitals like Rome, Madrid and Lisbon but metropolises often locked in fierce competition with regional urban centres- Milan, Barcelona, Porto; alongside these, a variety of smaller capitals such as Zagreb or Belgrade.

So what about the available work on specific regions? In the immediate postwar era the amazing Ferdinand Braudel promoted a regional approach with his study of the Mediterranean world. Though this was not specifically urban in focus ( it has only two sections specifically on cities) , it illuminated the complex commercial links between cities right across the Catholic and Islamic Mediterranean region. Braudel emphasises the role of cities as economic and cultural generators but has much less to say about interaction through migration, architecture or the service sector. What is particularly valuable however is that Braudel's Mediterranean is not narrowly defined but open-ended, reaching out to the Levant, Egypt, North Africa and Black Sea and the Atlantic- with obvious global implications. But after Braudel it seems to me interest in the region waned (even Braudel turned to other subjects in his later years). New recent work on the region by ancient historians and others lacks a strong urban focus. But I would be interested in your comments.

In Eastern Europe the late 20<sup>th</sup> century saw pioneering work by the famous Hungarian historian Vera Basckai on urban networking across the region, work that has been continued by her student the medievalist Katlin Szende. In addition, there is a growing literature on planning and architectural innovation in the region before and after the First World war, while for the modern and contemporary period there is a new important literature by Polish geographers and other social scientists on urban development in the East/Central European region.

Paradoxically, some of the most extensive regional work in recent times has been largely invisible, or rather flying under a false flag. This work has focussed on Western Europe, helped by major research funding in Britain and more recently in the Low Countries. In consequence, there has been a growing output of articles and books, ostensibly discussing the European city but *in reality* basing the analysis primarily on Western Europe, usually with a bit of Northern Italy added. Take for instance the 2019 monograph by the Dutch scholar Maarten Prak *Citizens without Nations; Urban Citizenship in Europe and the World*. This is a brilliant book which opens up a whole new vista on urban politics and community before the French Revolution. I urge you to read it! But is it really about Europe as it claims? In practise the main concern is with the bigger cities of England, the Low Countries, parts of Western Germany and predictably Northern Italy. In other words, Western Europe PLUS. Other European urban regions barely figure. The numerous towns of outer northern Europe are largely ignored: Eastern Europe hardly does any better. Prak is not exceptional. Much of the Anglophone literature ostensibly on European urbanization whether one thinks of the work of Lynn Lees or Jan de Vries or others is heavily biased in the analysis towards this West Europe PLUS region. Their focus echoes many contemporary studies by geographers and other social scientists on the so-called blue banana of big cities stretching from southern England through Western Europe into northern Italy. This elision, this confusion of urban Western Europe with the European city, has three malconsequences. Firstly it leads to an oversimplification of our view of the European city. TO return to the Prak book,. Prak's stress on the strong communal identity of the larger corporate towns ignores the tens of thousands of small, largely noncorporate and/or seigneurial towns that were a particular feature of Northern and Eastern Europe and in which civic communal identity was much less developed. Secondly it distracts us from trying to understand what was truly distinctive about the West European urban region.

Finally and most important for my argument it has tended to deter the systematic study of other urban regions such as Northern Europe.

This takes me on to the second part of this lecture: a case study of urban Northern Europe where I want to develop in more detail some of the points I have already raised. For the last 20 years, as Donatella has said, I have been based in Helsinki in Finland and in that period as elsewhere there has been a major growth of urban history research- national, regional and local- not just in Finland but in other Nordic countries, also in Ireland, Scotland etc. Until recently however there has been limited regional collaboration by urbanists in the field. The first meeting of Nordic researchers took place in Stockholm in 2019. This is perhaps not surprising because Northern urban history has been a veritable historiographical blackhole, ignored in many of the general surveys of the European city. Jan de Vries in *European Urbanisation* lumped the North together with Western Europe as an analytical category. Paul Hohenberg e Lynn Lees in their *Making of Urban Europe*(1985) have one reference to Scandinavia and none to Finland. Alex Cowan's *Urban Europe* (1998) has no mention of Scandinavian cities at all. Even Nordic historians have generally failed to address the subject.

Thus the comparative, regional narrative of the Northern city remains surprisingly underdeveloped. Why? Firstly there is the problematic definition and indeed construction of Norden- the Northern region. Reviewing the literature on the Northern region by intellectual historians, one is struck by how much emphasis is put on the *external* political and cultural determinants and how little on the *internal* economic and urban factors in defining the concept of Northern regionality. Second, there is the related problem of defining urban regions: how coherent, how convergent, how autonomous need they be? I will return to this problem in the final part of this talk.

To help us focus on the Northern urban region I want first to propose a taxonomy, a list of defining attributes. Secondly to highlight some of the key phases of urban interaction across the region.

But let me reiterate, following Braudel's example, I have an expansive, open-ended view of the Northern urban region, one which stretches in a broad arc from Ireland through Scotland and Iceland to the Scandinavian countries and Finland, maybe also the Baltic state cities.

Contextually this outer Northern region, is distinguished from the rest of the continent by its cool climate, its often difficult soil, its crucial proximity to the sea, its sparsity of population. Geophysical factors are vital for understanding the region's urban narrative.

In terms of urbanisation trends we find a distinct trajectory, compared to other European regions. As we saw in my graph earlier. Very low urbanisation rates in the Middle Ages, at the bottom of the European spectrum. Then a trend catching up with Eastern Europe in the early modern era. Before rising sharply and dynamically in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, overtaking the Mediterranean City by the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century. Then stabilising in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, with similar levels of urbanisation to Mediterranean and Eastern Europe.

This specific trajectory is framed by the distinctive architecture of the urban system across outer Northern Europe. Firstly, because there was no Roman occupation of the North, only a few towns were established before the 11<sup>th</sup> century. In fact the great majority were founded from the late Middle Ages into the early modern period- the 17<sup>th</sup> century was particularly formative in Ireland, Scotland and Finland. This late development is in marked contrast for example to Mediterranean or Western Europe where the vast majority of towns had been founded before the Black Death in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, and many much earlier. Secondly, we see an urban

region of predominantly small towns. In the Swedish-Finnish kingdom during the 1770s 93 % of towns had fewer than 5,000 inhabitants. In Scotland in 1639 only 11 per cent of towns had more than 2,000 people, many much less.

Thirdly, almost all the larger established towns were ports: thus we see a series of early port towns down the east coast of Scotland from Aberdeen to Edinburgh and its haven of Leith. We see a similar pattern on the coasts of Norway, Sweden, Finland and Denmark. Frequently port towns acquired or claimed a monopoly of non-local trade, leaving inland towns with only limited rural commerce.

A fourth feature of the outer Northern urban system was the presence of a very small number of bigger cities, usually only one per country, mostly capitals. Even these were modest by European standards. In 1650 Copenhagen had 23,000 inhabitants, Stockholm 40,000, Dublin 17,000, Edinburgh 35,000. into the late 20<sup>th</sup> century the Northern metropolises remain modest on a European, let alone a global scale: none figured in the biggest 50 European cities in 2016.

Not only were Northern cities and towns predominantly small, but they shared other features into the modern period. In contrast to the many walled towns of the Mediterranean, Western and to some extent Eastern Europe, they were mostly open towns with limited if any fortification. Sometimes they had gates but no walls; sometimes just wooden fences.

A related point. The weakness ( or absence) of civic self governance in Northern towns in the pre-modern era is equally striking. In Scandinavia town charters were widely used by kings to promote economic and political control. Municipal autonomy was limited. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century Swedish and Danish kings interfered extensively in the running of urban communities and access to foreign trade was strictly regulated. Fundamental was the small scale and economic and



financial weakness of many of the towns of outer Northern Europe, their small elites overshadowed by the power of landowners and the Crown.

As we know from Braudel, regional urbanism is clearly shaped by interconnectivity and interaction between cities. And this is particularly evident in outer Northern Europe, facilitated by its proximity to the sea. This was an urban system constructed on the shores of the North Atlantic, North Sea and Baltic and structured, as we shall see, by a great deal of maritime interaction.

I want to go on now to highlight of the most important phases of interaction across the wider region. To repeat, no Roman towns were founded in the region. Though early proto-urban trading centres probably existed in parts of the region, the first establishment of meaningful towns owed much to the Vikings. From the 8<sup>th</sup> century a number of towns emerged in Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Ireland, though not in Scotland. Whether Viking invaders brought existing notions of towns from Scandinavia to Ireland or whether Viking urban innovations in Ireland, as at Dublin, were transhipped north remains unclear. Brutal raiding was an important ingredient of the early invasions, but so too was long distance trade (with traffic to the east, to the Russian Volga and maybe Byzantium, complementing links across the North Atlantic to Greenland and beyond). As archaeologists and others have shown, goods were exchanged around the region, along with culture, practises and people. Arguably, the most enduring contribution the Vikings made to Ireland was the foundation of major coastal towns, notably Dublin, with its distinctive Hiberno-Norse features.

From the 12<sup>th</sup> century the outer Northern region was eroded by state formation in Scandinavia and the first waves of external pressure from an expansive Western Europe. The English invasion and conquest of Ireland in the 12<sup>th</sup> century and the growing intrusion of German Hanseatic traders, along with German artisans,

in Scandinavian port cities had important consequences. Irish towns were colonised and rebuilt and new ones established on the English model; in Scandinavia and the Baltic lands German merchants and artisan guilds dominated trades and sought to exclude competitors from Scotland and beyond.

However, from the later Middle Ages political alliances between Scotland and Scandinavia served to facilitate the revival of urban interaction across the region. Benefiting from the rapid decline of the Hanseatic League in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, trade between Scottish and Norwegian ports increasingly flourished with imports of timber exchanged for grain, salt and other goods. As Steve Murdoch and others have demonstrated, from the 16<sup>th</sup> century Scottish merchants became leading figures in Nordic towns, bringing capital and overseas trading networks to their communities. In Norway Bergen had over 300 Scottish residents; In Sweden Stockholm hosted c. 1600 around 350 resident Scots, some on the city council. At Swedish Gothenburg leading Scottish entrepreneurs grew powerful and became prominent in the China trade of the East India Company founded there in 1731. Migration was a powerful adhesive to urban interaction across the region.

At the same time, Scottish towns maintained close ties across the wider region to Irish urban development. A number of the new towns established in 17<sup>th</sup> century Ulster were populated by Scots while the large-scale rebuilding of Dublin as a classical Enlightenment city from the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century attracted Scottish artisans across the Irish sea ( many Scots towns at that time were in crisis).In turn, 18<sup>th</sup> century Dublin served as a model and inspiration for the construction of Edinburgh's own classical-style New Town built from the 1780s.

By the late 18<sup>th</sup> century Edinburgh with its many learned societies, publishers and intellectuals had become the leading cultural and intellectual centre in Northern Europe: the Athens of the North. In the 1760s James Macpherson's

publication there of the poetry of the Gaelic writer Ossian, mostly famously the epic work Fingal, set off a literary and cultural explosion across Northern Europe the 1770s notably in Stockholm, Gothenburg, Turku, Copenhagen and in Iceland (mostly Reykjavik). Interest also crossed the Irish Sea to Dublin. Interest in Ossian helped fuel enthusiasm amongst the Northern urban literati for ancient languages, including Finnish language and culture, leading to the publication of *Kalevala*, a saga type text crucial for Finnish national identity.

But 1800 marked the high tide of interaction across the Northern urban region. During the 19<sup>th</sup> century the urban region was overshadowed by external forces, and undermined by internal divisions. The rapid urban and industrial growth of Western Europe, combined with largescale state formation there, had major disruptive effects. Thus cities of both Scotland and to a lesser extent Ireland were sucked into the powerful commercial and industrial vortex of an expanding British empire; German Prussia annexed Danish cities; while further east the Russian empire seized Finland from Sweden and imposed a new capital city, Helsinki, on its new grand duchy.

However by 1900 one can see the a new convergence and interconnectivity in the Northern region, particularly in the Nordic core. A precondition was strong urban growth, linked to manufacturing expansion and agricultural transformation. No less striking was the rapid increase of population of the capital cities. Most clearly there was growing cultural and architectural emulation. From the 1890s the National Romantic Movement left a distinctive imprint on the urban landscape of public buildings in Finland, Sweden and Denmark ( more so than elsewhere in Europe) and after 1910 this in turn gave way to the influence of Nordic Classicism exemplified by the Stockholm City Library, the Finnish Parliament House, and the Copenhagen Police Headquarters. Ecologically, allotment gardens spread from Danish cities, to Stockholm and so to Finnish cities

like Helsinki. While innovations often originated from outside the region, they were adapted, even transformed within it. The Nordic urban mediation of architecture and planning developments is particularly evident in the spread of the Functionalist variant of International Modernism before and after the Second World War. By this time links between Nordic architects and landscape designers were strong.

In the late 20<sup>th</sup> convergence and cooperation has expanded across the wider Northern region. Since the 1980s Dublin and the bigger cities of the Irish Republic have grown new style tech and service centres, a trend paralleled in Nordic cities in the later 20<sup>th</sup> century. In Scotland growing links with Scandinavia, through the energy industry and EU sponsored educational and research cooperation have proved significant in boosting economic growth. In 2017 Norway had returned to being one of Scotland's leading trading partners, while thousands of Norwegians attend Scottish urban universities. In 2007 the then Scottish chief minister talked of a new Arc of Prosperity linking Ireland, Scotland and the Nordic states, in which their cities had become leading players. Arguably Brexit and possible Scottish independence may turn this Arc into increased inter-urban reality.

I hope this short discussion will have given you some idea of the distinctive nature of the Northern urban region- with its late town foundations, its late urbanisation, its phases of economic and cultural interaction and its specific urban hierarchy of small towns, ports and dominant but modest sized metropolises, veritable pigmies in world rankings. We have also seen the pressure of living on the doorstep of Western Europe with its assertive states and powerful economies and corporations, impacting on the cohesion of the Northern urban region. But

above all I trust you have got some detailed, practical idea now of what I am interested in and the importance and complexity of the issue of urban regionality on a European scale.

In the last part of this lecture I want to reflect on the challenges and opportunities of a more regional approach to European urban history.

Clearly one of the most important challenges is how we define regions. In my *European Cities and Towns* I proposed a schema of European region but it is more important for historians from within a region to set the broad parameters, to define the boundaries. As I noted earlier, there are inevitable questions about how coherent, how convergent, how autonomous need they be. My view would be that following Braudel one needs to define regions expansively, as I did for outer Northern Europe, going beyond the traditional definition of Norden with its focus just on the Nordic countries and Nordic cities. Because as we saw, urban regions can both expand and contract, they can converge and diverge, they can be more autonomous at certain times. They are not fixed, they are dynamic.

Again in terms of definition, of identifying the matrix of defining variables I would suggest we adopt a broad catholic strategy. Following Braudel, clearly geo-physical, structural features are crucial. As we saw in urban Northern Europe, climate, population density ( or lack of it) and the maritime construction of the urban world are vital. The same points can be made for other European regions- not just the Mediterranean region, but Western Europe ( heavily dependent for its economic success on the Atlantic ocean) and Eastern Europe, dependent on the great rivers that cross it, notably the Danube, the Volga and others, rivers that generate not only trade but industries.

But we need to go beyond Braudel and his emphasis on trade networking by merchants. Migration flows between countries are clearly important with ethnic

communities the power hubs of interaction, but so are political and institutional links and parallels. For instance in Mediterranean we might look at the parallels between the way Islamic and Christian cities attracted and regulated ethnic communities .Eg through Muslim funduks/ wikalas (top, Cairo) & Venetian fondacos and ghettos .Here as we saw in Northern Europe, those crucial urban forces of competition and emulation play a critical factor in shaping the interaction of cities across a region. We see that in architecture and other forms of cultural diffusion. We already noted the way that Nordic cities before the First world war copied each other architecturally with first the adoption of the National Romantic style in public buildings and then Nordic Classicism. In Eastern Central Europe before the First World War Vienna architects designed Ringstrasse style buildings across the Austro-Hungarian empire and beyond-in Zagreb, Prague, Bratislava, Ljubjana and Sofia. In the same way Moscow's Stalinist Socialist realism architecture had its emulators, its monumental clones, in cities right across the Soviet bloc in Eastern Europe.

As well as issues of scale and definition, ironically another challenge that confronts the student of urban regions is the current pattern of research. As we noted earlier, the explosion of detailed work on urban history in recent years has had a strongly national or specific local focus. And with this has come different research agendas between countries with different subjects and periods prioritised. This makes comparative study across a supranational region more complicated.

So much for the challenges, what about the opportunities offered by a wider regional approach? First of all, it enables a more realistic approach to European urban development. We may recall with fitting nostalgia those pioneering works by Edith Ennen on *The European Town in the Middle Ages* or Leonardo Benevolo on *The European City*, but such a continent-wide construct is not truly meaningful or useful except when we are trying to make comparisons with cities in the Middle East and East Asia or the Americas. Comparative scale is everything. By focussing more on major regions *within* Europe urban historians can take a path already being followed extensively by geographers and political scientists who talk much more about Western Europe, Central/East Europe, Mediterranean cities and so on.

Secondly, such an approach enables us to shed further light on those two crucial themes in urban development already mentioned- competition and emulation. I noted earlier their importance for intra-regional development but we also need more explicit analysis of the competition between different regions across urban Europe. In my Northern case study I pointed out how both in the high Middle Ages and during the 19<sup>th</sup> century the urban system of Western Europe impacted on, indeed shrank, the network of Northern cities, eroding commercial and political linkages. Equally, the rise of Western European cities at the expense of the Mediterranean region deserves more attention. Global historians debate about the Great Divergence between Europe and China in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, as the former's growth accelerated, but what about the so-called Little Divergence between the urban Mediterranean and Western Europe? When and why did it start? We should be wary of accepting at face value all the complaints against Italian and Spanish cities by West European visitors in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, criticising them as empty and decayed. Arguably, we should see this, conscious or not, as part of a cultural strategy to downgrade their Mediterranean rivals. The same pattern

can be observed of the urban economies of the Eastern Mediterranean, the Ottoman Balkans. Dismissed by Westerners for long as decayed in the 18<sup>th</sup> century Turkish and Balkan historians have increasingly revealed the economic buoyancy of the city network at this time. As we saw in our graph earlier in the lecture, the real take-off of urban Western Europe and the marginalisation of Mediterranean cities (albeit not all) probably comes later, in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century when industrialisation spreads outside England, West European nation states consolidate and colonial empires expand.

Another dividend of a wider regional analysis is that it brings more clearly into focus the relationship between urban regions and their extra-European neighbours. Long ago Braudel's work was important for exploring the middle Eastern and North African hinterland of Europe's Mediterranean cities but for Western European cities the many sided relationship between capitals like London, Paris and Brussels and their Asian and African empires has only started to be discussed in more recent literature with a greater awareness of the cultural, economic and political impact of the colonies on metropolitan society. In sum, our conceptualisation of Europe's urban regions needs then to be dynamic, multi-sided and open ended, offering at its widest a global perspective.

This brings me to a final methodological point. As I have tried to show, regional analysis on a European scale provides a valuable space for comparative studies, an alternative from narrowly national or local researches. It often requires us to look at trends over the long term, as we saw in my North European case study. And to be done in a systematic way it needs to mobilise the skills not just of historians, but of archaeologists, architectural historians, planners and others. In



this way it fulfils, it furthers all those ambitious goals of urban history that I explained at the start this lecture.

Let me sum up, today I have been trying to put on the discussion table a subject which Braudel pioneered long ago, and which has had insufficient attention from European urban historians. In the United States the importance of urban regional networks - the so-called Rustbelt cities of the Midwest, the Sunbelt Cities of the South East and those on the West Coast-, has long been recognised by urban historians. On this side of the Atlantic, social scientists have also seen the importance of Europe's urban regions in their extensive literature. It is time for European urban historians to catch up. And hopefully this is now starting to happen. The new *Cambridge Urban History of Europe* in three volumes is incorporating important analyses of Europe's urban regions which hopefully will trigger more exciting research. Confronting us are important challenges as we saw in the case study of Northern cities. But the opportunities offered by this approach are surely worth pursuing.

Thanks for your attention!

